

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8       **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9                   EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10  
11 DANIEL RODRIGUEZ QUINTERO,  
12                   Petitioner,  
13                   v.  
14 WARDEN TRISTAN LEMON,  
15                   Respondent.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01319-EPG-HC  
  
ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

16  
17       Petitioner Daniel Rodriguez Quintero is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition  
18 for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

19       When a state prisoner files a habeas petition in a state that contains two or more federal  
20 judicial districts, the petition may be filed in either the judicial district in which the petitioner is  
21 presently confined or the judicial district in which he was convicted and sentenced. See 28  
22 U.S.C. § 2241(d); Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 442 (2004) (quoting Carbo v. United  
23 States, 364 U.S. 611, 618, 81 S. Ct. 338, 5 L. Ed. 2d 329 (1961)). Petitions challenging the  
24 execution of a sentence are preferably heard in the district where the inmate is confined. See  
25 Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). Petitions challenging convictions or  
26 sentences are preferably heard in the district of conviction. See Laue v. Nelson, 279 F. Supp.  
27 265, 266 (N.D. Cal. 1968). Section 2241 further states that a district court, “in the exercise of its  
28 discretion and in furtherance of justice[,] may transfer” the habeas petition to another federal

1 district for hearing and determination. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (court  
2 may transfer any civil action “to any other district or division where it might have been brought”  
3 for convenience of parties or “in the interest of justice”).

4 Here, Petitioner is challenging his criminal conviction in the San Diego County Superior  
5 Court, and thus, the petition is preferably heard in the district of conviction, which is the  
6 Southern District of California. Therefore, this action will be transferred. This Court has not  
7 ruled on Petitioner’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is TRANSFERRED to the  
9 United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
11

12 Dated: October 19, 2022

13 /s/ *Evan P. Gross*  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28